

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 22, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 22, 2005.

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 3-7, 11-15 and 18 stand withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 1-2, 8-10, 16-17 and 19-21 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 9 and 20 are objected.

Claims 8-10 and 20-21 are amended to correct matters of form. Claims 1, 16 and 19 are amended to clarify the invention. Applicants submit that these amendments do not include new matter.

Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claimed subject matter. The Examiner indicates that "textured upper surface" recited in claims 8 and 9 does not appear to be mentioned in the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse this objection on the ground that a patterned upper surface, which can be interpreted as a textured upper surface for people skilled in the art, has been described in detail in numerous places in the specification, e.g. paragraphs 0020, 0027, 0029, 0031, and Figures 6-7.

Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 9 by replacing the term "textured" with "patterned".

Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claims 9 and 20 stood objected to by the Examiner for informalities. Applicants submit that claims 9 and 20 have been amended to correct matters of form. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner indicated that the textured upper surface in claims 8 and 9 was not described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, a patterned upper surface, which can be interpreted as a textured upper surface for people skilled in the art, has been described in detail in numerous places in the specification.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended claims 8 and 9 by replacing the term “textured” with “patterned”.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Marmillion et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,934,977, hereafter *Marmillion*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Marmillion discloses a planarizing system having a pad carrier ring 16 configured to support and rotate a polishing pad 12, and a static block 14 with a discrete, non-continuous and flat raised portion 15 configured to uplift a portion 11 of the rotating polishing pad 12 (column 3 line 59 – column 4 line 9, Figure 1). The Examiner asserts that *Marmillion* teaches the block 14 supporting the polishing pad 12. However, the polishing pad 12 is supported by the pad carrier ring 16 (column 4 lines 22-32) and the block 14 only contacts the polishing pad 12 on the flat raised area 15 (column 4 lines 1-3).

Additionally, the objective of *Marmillion* is to reduce the “leading edge effect”, wherein a substrate is polished faster near the edge than near the center. Thus, *Marmillion* teaches away from the objective of the present invention which is to compensate the tendency of a substrate being polished faster near the center than near the edge.

Therefore, *Marmillion* does not teach, show or suggest a platen for supporting a polishing material in a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a body having

an upper support surface adapted to support the polishing material during processing, wherein the upper support surface is substantially rigid and non-planar and the upper support surface has no planar portion, as recited in amended claim 1.

Similarly, *Marmillion* does not teach, show or suggest a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a platen having a non-planar, substantially rigid upper support surface, wherein the upper support surface has no planar portion, a polishing material disposed on the upper support surface, and a polishing head adapted to retain a substrate against a working portion of the polishing material during processing, as recited in amended claims 19 and 21.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kasick* (U.S. Patent No. 2,819,568, hereafter *Kasick*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kasick discloses a backing plate 3 for a grinding or sanding disc used in portable grinders or sanders (column 1, lines 15-20). Thus, *Kasick* does not teach a platen for supporting polishing material in a chemical mechanical polishing system, as asserted by the Examiner. Further, *Kasick* teaches that the backing plate 3 having a substantially flat face for support a grinding or sanding disc (Figure 3, column 4 lines 65-67, and column 5 lines 30-32).

Therefore, *Kasick* does not teach or suggest a platen for supporting a polishing material in a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a body having an upper support surface adapted to support the polishing material during processing, wherein the upper support surface is substantially rigid and non-planar and the upper support surface has no planar portion, as recited in amended claim 1, and claims dependent thereon.

Similarly, a platen for supporting a polishing material in a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a body adapted to support the polishing material during processing, wherein the body has a substantially rigid non-planar upper surface defining an upper support surface for supporting the polishing material, and a plurality of

recesses formed in the upper surface, wherein the upper support surface has no planar portion, as recited in claim 16, and claims dependent thereon.

Therefore, claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 16 and 17 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 19, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hirose et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,888,126, hereafter *Hirose*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hirose discloses a polishing apparatus includes a turntable 1 configured to support an abrasive cloth 4. The turntable 1 has projecting regions 1a producing projecting regions 4a on the abrasive cloth 4 for more intensive contact with a substrate than the flat surface of the abrasive cloth 4 (Figure 2A-2B, column 3 lines 13-15, column 6 lines 1 to 39). *Hirose* teaches the abrasive cloth 4 supported by the turntable 1 having projecting regions and flat portions. However, *Hirose* does not teach a platen having a non-planar supporting surface which has no planar portion, as set forth in the present invention.

Additionally, the Examiner's assertion, in page 4 item 8 of the office action, that *Hirose* teaches a "body/platen (14) for supporting a polishing material (12)" is not supported by *Hirose*.

Therefore, *Hirose* does not teach a platen for supporting a polishing material in a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a body having an upper support surface adapted to support the polishing material during processing, wherein the upper support surface is substantially rigid and non-planar and the upper support surface has no planar portion, as recited in amended claim 1, and claims dependent thereon.

Similarly, *Hirose* does not teach a chemical mechanical polishing system comprising a platen having a non-planar, substantially rigid upper support surface, wherein the upper support surface has no planar portion, a polishing material disposed on the upper support surface, and a polishing head adapted to retain a substrate against a working portion of the polishing material during processing, as recited in amended claims 19-21.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 19, 20 and 21 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)